DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 021 954 VT 001 160

By- Mead, Margaret
THE CHANGING CULTURAL PATTERNS OF WORK AND LEISURE.
Manpower Administration (DOL), Washington, D.C.
Pub Date Jan 67
Note- 43p.; Paper delivered at the Seminar on Manpower Policy and Program (Washington, D. C., February 16, 1966).
EDRS Price MF- $0.25 HC- $1.80
Descriptors- *AUTOMATION, *EMPLOYMENT, *LEISURE TIME, SPEECHES

There exists today a series of discrepant ideas about the problem of work and leisure. Society in general feels that the wrong people will have the new leisure, that the professional persons of the country are going to work hard while those on the technical level will be less and less committed to their jobs. The new leisure will go to the imperfectly educated, unmotivated part of the community which will "misuse" it. The idea that each individual buys his way to food, shelter, education, and safety by holding a job was characteristic of the industrial revolution. The idea is no longer appropriate. A future problem will be how to devise a system in which every individual has dignity and purpose in society, and the society has a rationale for distributing the results of its high productivity. A way must be devised to simultaneously talk about full employment for the present and plan for a different kind of society in the future. The dichotomy between work and leisure must be eliminated. There is needed a new concept of participation in society, participation meaning something like citizenship. A question-answer interchange between speaker and audience is included. (SL)

ED021954
VT001160

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM

The Changing Cultural Patterns of Work and Leisure

by MARGARET MEAD

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF LABOR: W. Willard Wirtz, Secretary
MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION

- This report is one in a series of proceedings of Seminars on Manpower Policy and Program sponsored by the Manpower Administration. It presents a condensed transcript of the seminar held in Washington, D.C., February 16, 1966.
- The purpose of the Seminars is to provide a platform for guest speakers and for members of the Department of Labor and other agencies concerned with manpower problems to discuss issues arising from the development of an Active Manpower Policy.
- Expressions of opinion by the speaker, the moderator, and those participating from the audience are not to be construed as official opinions of the U.S. Government or the Department of Labor.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

SEMINAR ON MANPOWER POLICY AND PROGRAM
January 1967

The Changing Cultural Patterns of Work and Leisure

by MARGARET MEAD

OPENING REMARKS

Chairman—Mrs. Esther Peterson, Assistant Secretary of Labor for Labor Standards

MRS. PETERSON: Last night, when I left my office at 10:30—having been there from 8 o'clock in the morning—I looked over the jobs ahead for today, and saw that I was going to have this wonderful opportunity to hear our guest speaker. When I looked at the subject, "The Changing Cultural Patterns of Work and Leisure," I understood the work part, but I didn't understand the leisure part very well. I hope that our speaker can develop a few guidelines on leisure in the Great Society for some of us around here.

Today's subject is an exciting one. Changes have come remarkably in this whole area from the time when we were working to cut down the hours of work-exploitation. Our philosophy once was, "The Devil finds work for idle hands." Now many discrepancies have developed. Consider the large numbers of our youths, unskilled and uneducated, who are faced with almost unlimited leisure they would willingly forego, and housewives who may sense the effects of automation very early and complain sometimes about the effects of leisure. Executives also complain.

There are many problems ahead for us with many implications for our society. We have to develop new skills and devices for training and use our increasing leisure in new ways. I think it is fitting and right at this time in our history that the Government can sponsor a series of seminars of this kind in order for us to openly and freely discuss these questions and to look ahead as we are doing. You know that the forum we are having is part of a program to discuss the issues in the *Manpower Report of the President*. It always pleases me to think that the taxpayers' money is well spent when we can look at a situation, examine our problems, and look ahead, think, and plan.

Certainly, no one is better equipped than our speaker to explore the subject for today. I don't think I need introduce her; you are here because you know her. Her name, Margaret Mead, has been known to us for a long, long time. I especially remember her book, *Coming of Age in Samoa,* which brought a new dimension to the study of culture and people. Her lifetime adventures and intellectual explorations have fulfilled the promise of that early work, and have borne out the mission which she has said she was encouraged to adopt in childhood—to contribute to the knowledge man has about his world. She has taken special province, very special areas, for this. No one is better equipped to discuss the subject for us today than our very splendid and able Margaret Mead.

It is with great pleasure that I present her to you.

THE CHANGING CULTURAL PATTERNS OF WORK AND LEISURE

An Address by
Dr. Margaret Mead, Curator of Ethnology,
The American Museum of Natural History

DR. MEAD: Mrs. Peterson, ladies and gentlemen. I think that in spite of the introduction, I will have to take a few words to justify my having something to say to you on the subject. I spend my technical and professional time on the South Sea Islands, whose immediate relationships to this topic you may think are confined to leisure rather than to work. You have heard in the course of these seminars—and particularly in the first seminar last year when Donald Michael spoke about all our possibilities of working with human behavior and human society in terms of computers and simulators—that we now can simulate almost any one of our problems with very large numbers of variables and hope to find useful solutions. But we are a fairly long way from knowing what variables to put into the machine. The machine is capable. I don't think there is any doubt of that. It is capable and it is going to serve us very well. It's a machine in the widest possible sense of the whole cybernetic revolution. But it can only answer questions that we know enough to ask.

I work instead, technically, with what we sometimes call living models. That is, instead of constructing a logical mathematical model, programing it, and putting it into a computer, we find living instances placed in history where the real people are solving real problems in their own way within a spontaneous natural setting. We then attempt to get this living model not only to give us new answers, but to suggest new questions and to suggest things we would not have known enough to ask.

One of our principal problems at present, I feel, is that we don't know all the questions to ask. Running through some of the seminars in this series has been the complaint that we haven't the facts to answer this question or that question or the other question.

That is, of course, true. But I also think we don't quite know all the questions we want to ask.

Now, the sort of thing that one does in using a primitive community is to take something that has happened that one does not understand and go there and study it. When I went back in 1953 to a Stone-Age community I had studied in 1928, one of my friends who is very committed to quantitative models said, "You know what people say about anthropologists? They say they find what they went to look for. Can't you construct your hypotheses about what has happened to these people in 25 years, then compare it with actuality?" We knew the community had moved from the Stone Age into the present. It had gone through one of the most extreme changes ever reported, although we did not know anything about it otherwise. My friend, who was looking after my reputation, wanted me to make a set of hypotheses. He offered to have them witnessed, sealed, and put in the bank. Then, when I came back, my reputation would be vindicated and it could be proved—I don't know what exactly could be proved, but something—to which my answer was, "If I knew enough to form the hypotheses, I would not go. I would go somewhere else." Because what we hope for from this kind of situation is genuine new information.

What I actually found in this particular case was contrary to the assumptions we had all been making on the basis of pre-World War II change—that slow change is better than fast change, that you have to creep before you can walk. These assumptions are echoed in some of the seminar reports—that it will take at least a generation for us to do this or that or the other, that we cannot hurry people too far, that the only thing we can do is wait until older people are dead or retired. These assumptions were based on a theory of change that had been developed by anthropologists and other scientists—not economists, I might add. Economists were almost always in favor of very fast change and they were almost always on the opposite side from anthropologists. As a result, we were opponents. We, the anthropologists, insisted that you had to grow into a situation.

You had to grow into it slowly. You had to bring up the next generation to understand it. You had to wait until you got rid of the people who did not understand it, and so forth.

What I actually found in this community I had studied in 1928, again in '53, and '64, and from which I have just come back 3 weeks ago ('65) from a fourth field trip, was that the reason it had been able to do what it had done—skip about 2,000 years—was that it moved very fast. The people changed everything at once and did not leave any pieces lying around to drag the rest back. They involved everybody, to the oldest grandparent, and left nobody on the shelf, gave no permission to anyone to be old-fashioned and just sit. They were a little more lenient to the old than they were to the young. They said, "After all, they do lose their temper worse. But they were not brought up right." But this was the only concession that they made.

Looking at this very rapid change gave us a new set of hypotheses about change. We have had a good many other studies since then. Today, many anthropologists and economists are much closer together in their recognition that one of the things that makes for trouble in society is discrepant rates of change. When we were students, we heard a lot about cultural lag and about adaptive culture in which technical change and economic change were supposed to go racing ahead and human relations change was supposed to come crawling behind and there was to be more and more of a discrepancy. Today it is possible to say, instead, that if we can move fast enough and keep all the parts of society somewhat in pace with one another, so that one part does not pull down another, and so that the old don't pull down the young, and so that the badly educated school teachers don't pull down the better educated children, then fast change may actually be better than slow change.

Predictions Built for Too Few

Another thing I noticed in some of the reports of the other seminars that I found stimulating was the recurrent statement that our predictions have always been too slow and built for too few.

This has been going on everywhere in this country. Before we get it built, every airport we build is too small for the planes that are going to come into it. Every student union in the country is too small for the enrollment, before the roof goes on. Our continuous inability to predict the rapidity of change, which has gone all the way through the space program, through all of our predictions of new inventions of every sort, to the predictions of the need for airports or universities or whatever, is one of the things that I think we ought to ask some questions about.

So what I want to address myself particularly to today in this background is a series of discrepant ideas that we have about the problem of work and leisure that are going to bedevil the planners attempting to make some solutions to this problem.

Mrs. Peterson said, hopefully, you know, that the notion that "Satan findeth mischief for idle hands to do" is all gone. I'm afraid it isn't. Certainly not when it affects the lower classes. If you listen to any discussion in this country about what is going to happen with this new leisure, one thing is perfectly clear—"the wrong people are going to have it." No professional person has it. The elite of the country are going to work terribly hard and they are going to work harder and harder because there will be less and less commitment to their jobs by the next technical level. The new leisure goes through all the imperfectly educated, unmotivated part of the community who are going to "misuse" it. These are the same people who "have too many children." The notion that leisure breeds mischief, I would say, has not disappeared at all in many circles, which, fortunately, you do not move in. But it is a prevailing attitude over the country. It comes up in a discussion like that on a guaranteed annual income.

The term "guaranteed annual income" is misleading. Those who would likely get it don't have "incomes." Incomes are something "better" people have. An income is something you have when you are a professional and get paid by the month. If it is called a guaranteed annual wage, you immediately say it belongs only to wage earners. It comes under the heading of "welfare," rather than under the heading of responsible citizenship.

It is this kind of edge that is going to be significant, just as the invention of the word "dropout" was. You know, "dropout" was the total invention of an entirely new idiom, actually. We wanted to talk about all the people who had not gone to school, had not wanted to go to school, and most of whom nobody wanted to go to school. They couldn't have wanted anything less, most of them, than to go to school. We now speak as if they dropped out when all of us have been working night and day to keep them in. We treat people who stop school in the fifth grade as if they were third year undergraduates in Harvard. Perhaps the word originally came from Harvard. But by applying it to the entire American community and to people who had never thought of going on to school, and by treating them all as failures in obtaining what we now said we wanted everybody to obtain, we were able to mobilize the kind of attention and interest in back of the idea that we could not have done if we had not made such a shift. We might have made a different shift, of course. But we needed some shift. It was important to shift a whole nation away from the notion that some people ought to have some education, a few more people ought to have a little more, and a few people ought to have a little more still. The word "dropout" gave a picture of this procession upward of every child in the United States, each one of whom was supposed to go right through the school system, a procession from which some were falling out. It galvanized some of our thinking on the subject and many of you know how rapidly the word spread, how rapidly State committees, county committees, municipal committees, and committees of all the women's organizations in the entire country began worrying about dropouts.

Attitude Toward Work New

Now, on this whole question of how we are going to look in the future at the problem of work, leisure, and recreation, how we are going to divide employment, how we are going to define it, it will

be, I think, useful to look at the traditional attitudes still around and a part of the whole picture. To begin with, it may be rather useful—and it isn't done very often—to realize that our traditional attitude toward work is actually very, very new. The notion that no human being should eat unless he or she has a job or is a dependent of someone who has a job, prevalent for a couple of hundred years, was a new idea. It's true that in Tudor England if someone came into the community as a pauper, the town fathers used to carry him out into a meadow to die so that the community would not have to bury him. But these were strangers. There was not the assumption that the group to which one belonged should not care for one. The idea that each individual buys his way to food and shelter, education and safety, by holding a job is terribly new and was characteristic of the Industrial Revolution with which we have now more or less finished. It is no longer appropriate. So the brevity of the period when work was a job and paid work was one's only guarantee of belonging in a society is very brief and is not an inalienable part of human nature. It is not a correct description of the way man lived for hundreds of thousands of years. In almost every group we know of where peoples stayed where they were or lived in tribes or in villages, working at a fixed job for pay was not the idea at all.

Many peoples do not even have a dichotomy of any sort between work and play. The Balinese have no category for "tired" but they have one for "too tired." You get too tired from occasional things that require massive effort, like a plowing bee when everybody puts a costume on the oxen and plows from morning until night. Then you get too tired. But otherwise, the word that they use for work is also the word they use for feasting, for festivals, and for gay activity. The notion that something must be done that you don't want to do, in order that you will be rewarded with a little bit of time in which you do what you want to do, is a particular Puritan invention. It's like our general attitude toward food. "If you eat enough food that is not good but is good for you, you can then eat a little food that is good but not good for you." This has been our basic notion about work and recreation.

Leisure Is a Reward

We also, I think, have to add in the various uses of the word "leisure," which we still have to think about. Leisure, on the whole, is when people are doing what they want to do, doing something that is of no human use to anyone but themselves. It does not apply to contributing to the community. That is not really leisure. Leisure may be well earned. On the other hand, it may be based on the hard efforts of ancestors. But however the idea of leisure is qualified, it essentially means something that people have got somehow, preferably by work. So it's very "bad" for unemployed youths to have it, because they got it by flunking out of school. They are utterly unable to use it. They should not have it at this stage. Or take the theory of the leisure class who are using leisure to promote their own status, or people who say, "I never have any leisure to think." People who say that are people for whom, on the whole, you would say, thinking is an indulgence. You do not get this statement so much from people whose job it is to think. However we look at it, we don't approve of leisure. The picture of a society in which more people, and mainly the wrong people, are going to have leisure, fills us with apprehension. Of course, all sorts of agencies are trying to get hold of leisure and use it "constructively" to see that people are spending their time right. Of course, it's a great opportunity for education and things of this sort!

Now, the idea of "recreation" was a wonderful invention and is one term which the Government can use, of course. We have had recreation commissions. We have had conferences on recreation, and the Government can use the term without reproach. I think a Government Commission on Enjoying Leisure would be regarded as a frill by many legislators. But "recreation" is all right, because the major point about recreation is that you get ready to work again. Any kind of recreation that does not get you ready to work, such as staying up too late on Sunday night, is unhealthy. Genuine recreation means you are re-created. You are healthier. You don't get rashes from poison ivy or aren't bit-

ten by too many mosquitoes. You don't drink too much and smoke too much, or even stay up too late. But you are bright eyed and bushy tailed and ready for Monday morning. This is healthy, good recreation. A community that has it can be proud of the state that it's in.

So a struggle is going on in this country. It has been going on now ever since the first hint of automation made us begin to suspect that our future problem was not going to be how to create enough jobs, nor how to increase productivity. We are going to be able to do that to an almost unlimited degree. Our problem is going to be how to devise a system in which every individual's participation in society is such that he has dignity and purpose, and the society has a rationale for distributing the results of its high productivity.

Ever since this has dawned on us, we have had to come to grips with the dichotomy between work and leisure, or work and recreation. Recreation is not going to be any good any more, unless you do enough work. So the idea of recreation is going down. You hear instead, about too much leisure. It is said that people are too uneducated to use their leisure, or that people are going to spend their leisure in front of a television set. There is a continuous worry with a picture of society conjured up in which there are going to be only little pieces of work. Some people think of shorter hours. Some people think of shorter work weeks. Some people think of larger chunks of vacations for high executives. But however the thought is phrased, we are drawing up a picture in which work remains the same, but shrinks. Around these little islands of work, which are still phrased as jobs, there are going to be great wastelands of leisure, in which we think of ourselves as having a terrible problem in developing fitting activities consonant with our general ethical idea—which will remain the idea that people should work, that the only thing that gives dignity to a human being is work, that what people need is useful work. The difficulty, of course, is that this has been true and is still true today, but it soon may not be.

If you find 100,000 boys standing on street corners who have finished school, and have no jobs, what they need is jobs, and they are lacking in dignity if they don't have those jobs. So one of our transitional problems is to continue to meet what is really here, but to use what is really here to prepare for the future.

Need to Combine Old and New

I also encountered, in some of these seminar reports that I read, people who said moderately, "Well, I don't think it's going to happen right away. I agree these things are going to happen, but not right away. Meanwhile, we are in a period of transition and we must work in a period of transition." This has been the policy that has been advanced by many of the people shaping the Great Society. Maybe we will not need to talk about full employment in 20 years, but right now we do. So I think one of our major problems is to devise a way of simultaneously talking about full employment—taking the boys that have finished high school in Detroit and do not have jobs, and finding some way to give them jobs—and at the same time, talking about giving them jobs in a way that is not going to bind the future, in such a way that we will be able to think about a different kind of society.

One of the things that was very striking when I looked at my primitive people who had skipped 2,000 years is that they had a model to skip to. That is, they were reaching toward a society which they had distilled from their experience in World War II. It was not exactly accurate in some respects. Their model was the American Army and this meant a degree of generosity that perhaps does not characterize the entire American public. They had a conception of the value we placed on human life, because they saw the tremendous amount of medical nursing and technical care given every wounded soldier in World War II. They said that Americans think that the only thing that matters in the world is human life, individual human life, and material things don't matter. (The Army was giving material things away on a fairly large

scale.) They then added that the reason Americans think material things don't matter is because they have so many of them—whereas, usually the European comment on America is that because we have so many of them, we must think they matter. Anybody who has two bathrooms must obviously think bathrooms are the most important thing in the world. This is the European judgment on the situation.

As the Manus people I was studying moved toward a different kind of society they may have misconstrued us in many cases, and caught our ideals rather than the actuality. But nevertheless, they thought we had done it and that all they had to do was try. There were only 5,000 of them and 180,000,000 of us. They thought that they were going to have to work pretty hard. But they started right away. They moved awfully fast and they were able to practically skip transitions. They were moving toward a known goal. We don't know anything actually about how to move toward an unknown goal in a known direction, that is, toward a series of events or situations that have never occurred before.

Mr. Conway, when he spoke to this group at a seminar last year, discussed the importance of having an agency to assess our overall direction in the discussion of goals. But if we were to set up a public body or set up public bodies in this country, one of their great tasks would be to look at what we are doing now and see what this means for the future.

I want to take one particular example of the way in which we use these terms "work," "pay," and "jobs;" a discussion of what we should do about students. Should we pay them for going to school? Now that sentence brings out almost every attitude we have about work, leisure, responsibility, and age grading in the whole society. "Going to school is a privilege." You should never pay people for privileges. Going to "good" schools is a privilege. People who have worked hard and whose parents have worked hard can send their children to good schools. Therefore, society should not pay students because their parents have already worked hard. They have earned the right to pay for their children,

a right that should not be taken over by society. The implication is that children are not people.

As long as one says children are not people, one is very much in danger of saying old people are not people, women are only people some of the time. Any limitation we place on saying every human being is a full person from the moment he is born is dangerous. I think we are moving more and more to the statement that each is a full person from before he is born, from the moment he is conceived—and we may move back a bit and take on a little supervision of whether he is conceived or not, and so give children the right to be born in a different period. This is one of the rights of unborn infants that really ought to be discussed, the right to be born in a less crowded period. But we are moving toward taking responsibility for the unborn, the only conceived, the just born, all the way up through the oldest person in the community. Possibly, we may go in for hibernation in which the fatally ill are frozen, to await new medical discoveries, and we can then conceive all of those individuals, too, as belonging to the total community. We can stop thinking in terms of segments of people: those of working age or not of working age, those who can be retired, the kinds of people eligible for relief, and those whose childhood can be extended as a way of keeping them out of society. Instead of letting children come in, we can pay them to go to school.

But does this not mean that going to school is work? That challenges our complete notion of what is school. Is it a privilege of the upper classes? You still hear a discussion about the means test. The only people who have a right to be helped are the people who did not get enough help in the society. Or, on the other hand, is school a duty that people should be subjected to without any participation in society? This is the kind of subjection under which we place young people, those who are too young to have had a chance to vote on the war they are fighting in. So we take a large segment of society and put it outside the picture. It belongs neither to work or play, but to some other limbo.

If, on the other hand, we say that anybody in school at any point from 2 to 80 years old is contributing to society, and as a contributor to society has a right to receive maintenance from society, then we would not talk about paying people to go to school. But we would be discussing going to school as well as performing every sort of work as part of involvement in society, and not think of the dichotomy between jobs and non-jobs. Or the other dichotomy which we recognize, that work is something you don't want to do, and you do it in order to enjoy 2 weeks vacation or 4 weeks vacation or 6 weeks vacation, and that the difference between a career and a job is that in a career you would pay other people to let you do it if they did not pay you to do it, and a job is something you only do because you have to in order to enjoy some other sector of life.

Of course, now, one of the possibilities is that we will accept this dichotomy between those who are doing what they want to do and those who are doing what they are forced to do. Some prophets are predicting that professional people and people who are technically competent, people who are gifted, will cease to make any distinction between work and leisure, or work and recreation, because for such people, there is no distinction. If they are doing what they want to and enjoying what they are doing, they just have life, that's all. They don't have recreation and they don't have hobbies and they don't have leisure in the ordinary sense of the word at all, just a piece of time to go into something else.

Mrs. Peterson says she doesn't have any leisure. I believe it, and I don't think you really want it, Mrs. Peterson. I know I don't want it.

Then we might build a society in which there is a series of very deep rifts, or possibly a gradual declension to the people on the edge who have to do something that they don't want to do, or as some people envisage, people who are simply supported and aren't allowed to do anything at all. So we will have a tremendous gap between the people who are doing what they want because they want to do it, and the people who are merely existing and

meeting some kind of a demand for some sort of nominal service to society. This is one possibility that we could very easily move toward in our phrasing, if we continue to look at life as filled with uneducable older people, poorly educated middle people, uneducated younger people, who are going to increase and who are going to be steadily less manageable, until we end up, as an economy measure, giving them some kind of guaranteed basic wage—while way up on top somewhere there are a group of people who are so delighted with what they are doing that they do not have time to stop working at all.

Dichotomy Must Go

If we did this, we would have completely defined the relationship between leisure, recreation, and work. But we would have built a society in which there would be vast numbers of people who had no real dignity and no real involvement. So I think one of our central problems at present is to begin to get rid of this dichotomy between work and leisure, between what you are paid to do, the way in which you get hold of a bit of the currency of the country, and your involvement in the country—between the right to experience the benefits, at a certain level of food, medical care, and education, and the possibility of using one's gifts to the limits.

We don't know how to do this at present. We have this loathsome word, subprofessional. We write articles about the fact that we really do need to increase the people in subprofessional tasks. Who in the world wants to be "sub" anything? We keep making these statements which interfere with a new kind of society. This is not going to be easy to change. The ghosts of the Irish Famine—when people were dying in the streets of the towns and the soup kitchen was put miles out of town so everybody would walk to the soup kitchen, so that they would have performed enough work to be allowed to eat—is still haunting a very large amount of our thinking. The notion that children aren't people, young people

aren't people, is pervading a great proportion of our discussion about full employment. Full employment as we are now thinking of it will involve fewer and fewer people. If we put lots of people in special categories and define them as not parts of society, we are carrying over these Puritanical types of distinctions between task and career and job, between working for a living and living, that have haunted industrial society since the beginning—certainly since the Industrial Revolution, and in some instances, even before.

We are going to need a new set of words. We are going to need a conception of what constitutes participation in society, with participation being something like citizenship. Citizenship is a magnificent word because it applies to everybody, regardless of age, sex, intelligence, beauty, or skill, and almost without regard to previous record. There are a few exceptions to this. But with those few exceptions, it applies to all of us.

What we are going to need in order to make such an effort is something that will be like citizenship. There is no word for it. The word will have to come out of the great inventiveness of the American public, a word that means participation in society sufficiently dignified so that the question of how much remunerated activity one engages in is not the relevant point. Instead the relevant point will be how the society is organized so that the work that needs to be done is done through all forms of participation—gaining weight as a baby, learning at school, participating at every level in one's community, and taking part in whatever productive services still require human beings—so that all of these things can in some way be placed on a single scale again. The scale will not deny the differences between the ambitious and the unambitious, or the talented and untalented, but will call for the participation of each individual in no less question than we now call citizenship.

DISCUSSION PERIOD

MRS. PETERSON: Thank you very much, Dr. Mead. It has been said there is nothing as painful as a new idea. If that is true, I'm afraid you have given us a lot of pain today. However, it is the kind of pain we all welcome very much. I think you have made a quite broad interpretation of the future implications of the *Manpower Report*.

There are so many questions. What is the first step you would take, Dr. Mead? You spoke about the possibility of work that is useful, that is what we like, that is both work and leisure for fullness of participation. Do you have some practical steps that you want to start us off with?

DR. MEAD: I think I would start off with education. That's the easiest way, recognizing that children are participating in society and, let's say from 14 on, they need to be underwritten like anyone else who is contributing to society—not paid to go to school, but underwritten—because they are making a contribution to their society that society has asked for.

MRS. PETERSON: You were talking about formal education in our schools. What do you feel about other kinds of education—the education we get from the mass media, the education we get from all of this second force? Are we all motivated by these other kinds of education? Are they really shaping our ideas from different directions?

DR. MEAD: I think they are very much more shaped than shaping. If you have enough discussion going on in the country, it gets into the mass media and the mass media begin using the new words. They suddenly discover a word like "*nationhood*." This is a good word. Everything that ends in "hood" is a good word. You all agree "motherhood," "brotherhood," and "nationhood" are good. The mass media pick up very rapidly. They picked up things like the population explosion and took it right around the world. They picked up the idea of school dropouts and worked on it. I think it's our business to provide the mass media with ideas.

MRS. PETERSON: It comes back frequently to schools. Are there some questions from the audience?

FROM THE FLOOR: I would like to know about the Manus people that you spoke about. First, what was the origin of their determination that change was necessary to make this 2,000 years leap in 25 years, and second, what was the procedure by which the change was accomplished?

DR. MEAD: Could you all hear the question? The question was: How can you establish a sense of direction in change? What was the origin of the Manus people's desire to change, and what was the mechanism?

I will have to really answer it at three levels here. They had a kind of education, not formal education, but a whole method of child rearing somewhat like ours. The children's notion of a good life was somewhat different from that of their parents. When they grew up they discovered what the life considered good by their parents really was. So there was a certain divine dissatisfaction in the children. We also cause this by presenting parents as models of virtue. By the time the children find out they aren't, it's too late for them not to have some belief that the things their parents claim to be are possible. From this, comes our idea of progress. These things are related. That is, there was in the Manus children expectation that life might be different from the life that the parents led. This hope was released by World War II because the young people did not go back, as they would have, to get caught in the treadmill of adult life. They sat around a little longer behind the lines, talking about what they wanted in the future. The spectacle of the American Army (we had over 2,000,000 men who went through Manus) and the glimpse they got of a different way of life—although just a glimpse and somewhat distorted idealistically—gave them the image of what they wanted. I think this means, in concrete terms, we have to give images to people of the place they want to go. Rehabilitation in Philadelphia has been an example of giving the public pictures, that is, models of what the city might look like if it did not look

the way it does. This is one of the important things that brought Philadelphia forward.

Finally, the most important mechanism to be used was a very good leader, a man who came from a group of about 700 people and had a mind roughly as good as FDR's. The Manus people did it themselves. It was not done to them. All the other change that we had known about were cases where somebody tried to change somebody else, motivate them, generate motivation. I think the moral for us is that we have got to create conditions under which people can do things themselves. It's going to be harder in a slum than it is on a South Sea Island.

MRS. PETERSON: Do you feel that there is a parallel to this in our effort to have participation in the poverty program?

DR. MEAD: Well, I am not very happy about the definition of something called "the poor." I think "the poor" is in many ways as poor a category as "the leisure class." To call people poor and label them as poor and then try to find somebody who is poor to do something, has a lot of things that aren't very good about it. I would rather use as a model what we did in Civil Defense in World War II, when we simply said every block had a task, and on every block somebody had to be a leader. In miles and miles of deadly dull miserable housing in places like Detroit where everybody knew there was no leadership, we found somebody in every block. But we found them by defining a geographic area, not by defining an economic category—not the poor but the residents of particular blocks.

MRS. PETERSON: Are there more questions?

FROM THE FLOOR: I ran across recent legislation passed by the Swedish Parliament under which university students are actually paid. I was attracted, because we want engineers and so many other highly skilled workers. But is it a good idea to give 18-year-olds complete independence from their families and surroundings by, for example, giving them an income? I would like to ask this question: Is there something in a certain age group of our society or the Swedish one, that makes it good to emancipate

talented 18-year-olds from their families and authority and give them income for studying?

DR. MEAD: The question is based on some considerations of what is going on in Sweden, where students are paid in some circumstances, and this provides a way of manipulating the number of students who would go into particular professions which might be very convenient for national planners. I am paraphrasing at that point: Whether it is also a good idea for society to prepare to emancipate their 18-year-olds from parental control and give them some degree of autonomy. We do this, of course, to some extent in the GI bill. This was the best example that we have had in this country of a case in which young people felt that they had a right to their education. They did not get an education from their parents. They had a right to it for what they had done for their country. They were the GI students after World War II. They were the best students we have ever had in this country. They stood on their own feet. They were not dependent on their parents. They were not dependent on their wives. Our present system of emancipation of men from their families is to turn their wives into the wage earners.

MRS. PETERSON: That should bring up some questions!

FROM THE FLOOR: You might add Robin Hood to this. Robin Hood to motherhood.

DR. MEAD: After all, he was a good bandit.

FROM THE FLOOR: Seriously though, let me ask a question that is perhaps peculiarly and poignantly pertinent to this gathering, or any such gathering in Washington. The conventional category that you described tends to sustain conventional institutions and organizations, since they reap their reward for such categories. Would you care to say something, particularly in the light of your observations on changing institutions in our culture, of what we are up against and how we would like to proceed to overcome obstructions in institutional change?

DR. MEAD: This is a question about the extent to which those who are in positions of responsibility in Washington may be handi-

capped in innovating institutional change, and what can one say about the process of changing institutions? Of course, there is one thing in this country: you must not say what you are doing. We share this taboo with the British. The British method of changing an institution is to say that it is a reform that is at least a century overdue. That means that your great-grandfather should have done it. He would have done it if he had been the right person, and you are just carrying out the mandate from your great-grandfather who planted the walnut trees that are now bearing walnuts.

In this country we have a different device, and that is to say we face a crisis. This is the first point. You can't do anything if there isn't a crisis. Some people use this rather lightly. They use the term too often and it gets worn out, like "Wolf! Wolf!" But you have to organize your statistics to show that if you don't do something tomorrow morning, absolute disaster will arrive in 6 months, and no longer time perspective from that is going to help very much either. You have to have these unemployed on the street corners standing on each others' heads before anybody will really pay attention.

MRS. PETERSON: Deaths on the highway.

DR. MEAD: Deaths on the highway and lots of deaths on the highway. There are going to be more deaths on the highway right away. Then you sweep this country. If you can get enough people agitated about one of these dreadful emergencies, it leads to overstatement and sometimes exaggerated interpretation of figures. But at the moment I think we have enough figures to prove almost anything ought to be done. If we use them well, we can prove that the delays in the court are such that the court should be reformed and we should have administrative law, or we should have something else, or we should have compulsory insurance on cars and get them out of the courts. There are 50 institutional changes which ought to be made, all of which can be justified by the state of the courts.

MRS. PETERSON: Is this where you get two packages?

DR. MEAD: Yes. You take the same bunch of figures and you get some figures well organized on the awful condition of practically anything. There are lots of them, and I think almost everyone in the United States would agree that they are awful. Because one of the curious things about Americans is that the people who are against something and the people who are for something agree on the basic premise. That isn't exactly what one means by consensus, but it's related.

During World War II we made a study about American attitudes toward food aid to the Allies at the end of the war. There was a nationwide study and when we analyzed the material, we found four categories of answers. One group said, "Yes, feed them." One group said, "Don't feed them." One group said, "We ought to feed them," and the fourth group said, "Well, I suppose we ought to feed them, but." All four groups ended their statements with: "But you can't let them starve." This was the key position.

So if you can build your statement on the conditions that require change, or analyze or organize the whole cluster of attitudes that gather around it, and find the key point at which the most extreme opponents in both political parties, and the extreme right and left, in every part of the country agree, then you can use your bad conditions which you started out with (Europe was starving) and you can build a fire under the effort to create the new institution. Now, I know you would also like a few blueprints as to how this is to be done. I don't think anybody has worked out a relationship between a permanent civil servant and a politician in these cases. I, on the whole, would let the politicians have all the credit. Some credit had also better go to the other party.

FROM THE FLOOR: You have a dislike of the term "poor." Would you comment on what the peak problems of the poverty war would seem to be?

DR. MEAD: I don't mind the word "poverty." Poverty describes a condition. It does not describe individuals. I think poverty is a good word that Americans dodged for about 50 years while we

talked about "low-income brackets." In World War II, you did not dare mention the word "poverty" in Washington. I had an Englishman come over here once and make a report to a big committee that had representatives from 22 Government agencies. He used the words "poor" and "poverty" and I was almost run out of town. We have underprivileged groups. We had economically underprivileged groups, professionally underprivileged groups, and we had the low-income brackets. That was a very popular term used by taxi drivers and such people. To face the fact that we had people who were poor, really straightforwardly poor, in terms of what we mean by poor, is an important thing.

There are people who are poor, but I don't like the term "the poor " because "the poor " is made up of identified individuals, men, women, and children, and to lump them together in terms of their condition denigrates their dignity. I am not objecting to the word "poverty." And I am not awfully fond of wars on anything, because I think they tend to spread sometimes, escalate in the wrong directions. I am not very fond of the war on cancer or the war on heart disease. I don't really believe we need this number of wars. Representation from the poor is a different thing from saying participation from the people who live in a particular area. They are real people who live there in houses, on streets. They are not a category. They are not lumped together and they are not denigrated.

FROM THE FLOOR: We seem to have a habit in the United States recently, of suggesting "education" as a prescription for a great many ills. Today you have mentioned this as one phase of life that at certain points might be subsidized. Education is many things, not just a television and the institution of schools. It's managed by thousands of school boards in thousands of communities. I wonder if education as we think of it as an institution in the United States is equipped to do the kind of thing you are talking about today. Would you care to comment on this? It's not one institution, it's many institutions. Some of them are perhaps not as forward looking as one might wish.

DR. MEAD: The question is, that education is far more than just schools or mass media. It's many things and it's embodied in many, many school boards and local institutions all over the country. Are these boards and institutions equipped to carry us into the future I outlined? Well, of course, some are more equipped than others. Nevertheless, in this country there is an enormous tendency to copy the rival institution or community that is just a little bit better than one is oneself. We would succeed if we made sufficient use—as we did in World War II, and haven't made a bit of use of since, really—of the fact that Town A regards Town B as its principal rival. If A's schools are better than B's, A will do nothing ever. So you go to B and tell B that A's schools are better than B's. B will fix its schools, and fix them to a point where you can tell A that B's schools are better than its schools. This works at enormous speed in this country.

It's a case of where disparity is picked up promptly and somebody forms a committee and says, "Isn't this dreadful? Look at what Cleveland is doing and Cincinnati is not doing a thing." This matters. This matters down to towns of 5,000. The model setting group for other groups means that even though we do have thousands of educational local school boards and local colleges, local universities and local technical institutions and what not, all over the country, they are all busy copying each other a mile a minute, collecting statistics on what other colleges of their category do, what other school systems of their category do. Everybody in the country is busy competing within his league. What one needs is to get some information in each league about the best member of it.

MRS. PETERSON: Are there more questions?

FROM THE FLOOR: I have been thinking about getting rid of Puritanism because I don't like the Puritans any better than you do, I guess. If we could get rid of all these vestiges of Puritanism and just have participation in society, we would not need much discipline. This discipline we have is a vestige of Puritanism and makes us all feel uncomfortable unless we feel we are doing our best to contribute and this is not very good for our psyches. We feel

compulsions and all that. We have an economy that does come from the Industrial Revolution in which many jobs are very unpleasant, although maybe not as unpleasant as they used to be. People have to contribute many times when they don't feel like it. Mrs. Peterson may not want too much leisure, but she probably didn't like to get out of bed and come to work during the recent snowstorm.

DR. MEAD: I thought nobody came to work during the recent snowstorm.

FROM THE FLOOR: I think what people may be worrying about is getting rid of Puritanism before we get completely through the technological revolution which is going to make all our jobs pleasant. I think we have to worry about removing monetary incentives too fast. Maybe we can substitute more center participation and social approbation, and so forth. I just wonder if we aren't oversimplifying the solution.

DR. MEAD: I am glad this question was asked. My questioner says she doesn't like Puritanism either. She thinks it would be fine if we were all more relaxed and got rid of these compulsions. But she wonders about a society that has grown up and has been disciplined under the imperatives of the Industrial Revolution, because so many unpleasant jobs are to be done that people have to go and do them when they don't want to. Isn't there a danger in just substituting participation or something of this sort for the discipline of the past? Is that a fair statement, would you say?

FROM THE FLOOR: I guess so. I mean I am just wondering if we are not getting a little too Utopian.

DR. MEAD: When I use the word "participation," I mean an order of membership in the whole economic social order of society. I don't mean we won't have to have sanctions. But there are a variety of sanctions that deal with unpleasant work. One of them is that if you do enough of it, then you can have a little more time to do something different. One of them is used in Australia. The nastier the work is, the better Australians are paid and the less they do of it. This is another possibility. I am not necessarily talking about removing monetary incentives.

I don't think we are going to stop using money. It's a marvelous invention. The people who dislike it have never lived without it, and I have. I have lived in societies where people say, "But you see, I don't want a male nautilus shell, I want a female nautilus shell. I won't sell this to you." "Yes, you have money. But what we want is tobacco. If you don't give us tobacco, we won't give you any fish." Then you live on canned tomatoes. To have currency that commands everything that is available in the society at a properly fixed price is an incredible, wonderful invention. I don't think we are going to give it up.

We are probably not going to give up a variety of sorts of incentives. This is not a question of giving up incentives, it's a question of giving a redefinition of the different kinds of participation. Some people may like borderline participation, which means that they do just so much. If they elect borderline participation, they may also do even less by doing something very disagreeable. Their share of the tremendous productivity in the society will be proportional.

But there is also the other point you raised. The opposite of Puritanism is not necessarily anything one wants. It sometimes is just plain lust or others among the seven deadly sins. A good proportion of what is going on in this country, at present, is not eliminating the type of dichotomy that once made Puritanism. It is just the other side of the picture. What we want is not the other side of the coin, not to say everything is fun, you know. We had a program in Washington trying to say that nutrition was fun. Everybody knew it wasn't, but we were told it was. Everything is fun. School is fun. Nutrition is fun. Having a lovely engineering job somewhere, where you have a collie dog and five children and a swimming pool is fun. This is the opposite of Puritanism. It can do more harm.

You know the definition: If you get the pain after the fun, it's vice; if you have the pain before the fun, it's virtue. On the whole, under those circumstances, I prefer the virtue. It is going to be very serious if we try to build a system of incentives that says life is fun, which is just the opposite of saying life isn't fun. What we

do need to build is a system of incentives where the activity itself is far more self-rewarding than it was in the past, and not simply the other side of the coin. That's the reason I am suggesting we break down the dichotomy—work-play or work-leisure or work-recreation—and break down the dichotomy completely. If we don't, we just switch from one to the other. It's either work or fun, or fun or work. And nobody is going to be very disciplined, having fun.

FROM THE FLOOR: I realize institutional religion is very split up. Yet, I wonder if you would care to comment on the role of institutional religion, both in its own need to change and the contributions it can make in the changes you desire or point to?

DR. MEAD: Institutional religion, in spite of its degree of "split-upness," and because of the degree of ecumenical understanding that is going on today, of course, is still in a position where either it can contribute enormously to the perpetuation of older and now inappropriate attitudes toward work and leisure or it can contribute to a climate of opinion which will make a different evaluation. I think the great contribution of institutional religion today is the elimination of hell, which has practically vanished in the United States. Something like 93.5 percent of Americans believe in heaven, but only a tiny fraction believe in hell.

This is a beginning contribution, but it's only a beginning, because if everybody goes to heaven, that's not very interesting either. It is the same contribution that was made when we stopped punishment in this country, but then depended on reward alone, instead of on the intrinsic quality of a relationship. Many of our forefathers were good because they were afraid they would go to hell, and a much smaller number, I think, were good because they hoped to go to heaven. I think the concrete fear of hell, in the sense that very few religious leaders would espouse it today, was a very important incentive in the past, and may become one in the future. I hope everybody is clear that we cannot predict the future. Anything may happen, including the return of hell, at any moment. But the fear of hellfire as an active incentive to hard work and to goodness is not an important element today.

The element that has replaced it, I think, in modern religion of many denominations, is the intrinsic reward of a relationship to God, not designed to colonize heaven on the one hand and not designed to avoid hell on the other. So the church has taken the first step, or whether it took it or not, the step was taken in this country. When people came over here and worked all their lives, and worked hard—with the hope of reward in heaven—they came to a reward on earth for working so hard. This dealt a rather mortal blow to heaven and hell as incentives.

It seems to me another way of getting rid of the dichotomy once so very important—the backbone of all the development that underlay the Industrial Revolution, the development of Western Europe and much of the development of the world, that other countries have valued us for—but which is no longer appropriate in this period of affluence. In this period we no longer say that some must suffer that others may eat. I think the church's great contribution will be to continue to reduce this dichotomy of reward or punishment and put greater emphasis on the intrinsic reward of a religious relationship to God now in this world, that is in itself inclusive, and whole, and rewarding.

FROM THE FLOOR: This may not be an entirely fair question, but it may run to the purpose of reference. I don't know whether your idea is possible or whether it's premature, in a world which is rapidly integrating. Aren't you talking in terms of a closed culture?

DR. MEAD: No, at least I am attempting not to talk in terms of a closed culture that can't stay closed. I think the only possible help is to talk in terms of the whole world and to keep the whole world in mind every single moment. But if we, who are testing the new limits of the new technology, fumble them and bumble them and fail to develop them right, what then happens to the rest of the world to whom we are an inevitable testing ground? Now, you may not want to be a model. You may not want to be an ideal. We would if we could very likely shirk the responsibility of taking the whole world on our shoulders. But we are the testing ground. We are the testing ground of what can be done with the

new technology. A great deal of new technology can do incredible things for the developing world if we would let it.

For instance, many people recommended at the United Nations Conference on the Importance of Science and Technology for the Developing Countries a couple of years ago that we send developing countries our obsolete equipment. Instead, we should develop and send brand new 1966 simplifications, not obsolete dregs of our own past. If we did this, we could make available to the developing countries very readily many of these most advanced changes. Lots of places won't have to go through all the stages we went through and don't have to use our obsolete, broken down sewing machines. We can, instead, use our resources to keep everybody busy, to give everybody a chance to make a contribution in the society, and a share of our tremendous productivity, and use that productivity in a variety of ways for the developing countries. This is one of the visions that has been developing during the last decade.

So I am not talking about a pretty little closed society where we get so much currency a month, like a data processing card which gets checked off when we buy a lot of luxuries, and liquidated at the end of the month, in a society cut off from the rest of the world. I'm glad you asked the question, if it looked as if I were doing that.

MRS. PETERSON: In the Declaration of Human Rights, doesn't it say we have the right to work and the right to leisure? Will you comment on that?

DR. MEAD: Yes. You know, that's out of the old picture. If you can only be a full member of your society, marry and bring up children or support yourself responsibly, if you have a job, obviously, then, a job becomes a human right. Leisure was thrown in because when the drafters mentioned work they thought they had better mention leisure. Look at the constitutions of the new countries, constitutions written after the war. A lot of these human rights were put into them for the first time. That was a great advance in 1950 or 1948. This is 1966. When the Declaration of Human Rights was drawn up, nobody understood automation.

They didn't even know about the population explosion at that time. These things are so new. These declarations were fine in their day, but I think they need a little revision now.

FROM THE FLOOR: In terms of some of your references to education and so on, what do you see as the probability that the American Government and the American people will give any effective recommendation to the United Nation's Declaration of Children's Rights—another of the schemas of rights which we have had in the last 10 or 15 years? These interesting formulations are somewhat Utopian, but I still think they are necessary. Would you comment as to what extent efforts such as Project Headstart are really effective political embodiments of these higher values?

DR. MEAD: I think Project Headstart was an excellent political embodiment of many of these values. I think the American people are singularly unresponsive to the moral leadership of the United Nations. One of the things hard to make Americans do is ratify any noble sentiment the United Nations thinks up first. We treat it as the opposite of us, as it were. The United Nations is the other team. If it starts it up first, we are not so much in favor of it as we would be otherwise. But the principles embodied in the idea of rights for children are exceedingly important in this country.

But recognition of their importance has been going down since the 1920's. The position of children, the importance of children, the importance of people who study children and work with children have been steadily deteriorating. People have noticed it in this country. Universities treat nursery schools as a liability and libraries as an asset in the child development program. The amount of research has gone way down, and up to the point where the poverty bill began picking things up, children were becoming less and less a focus of our interest and effort. This was perhaps a mark of the fact that we were in a static case of dullness, because in a society like ours, it is the focus on what we can do with the children and for the children that is essential.

I was once very much puzzled by a psychiatrist from India who said to me, "Of course, you know it's all very well what you do in

this country. I admire a lot of your psychology and things. The trouble is, you are always thinking about the past." I am used to Indians telling me that they have 4,000 years of civilization and we have none. So I was puzzled with this statement that we are always thinking about the past. He said, "You are always talking about children and childhood."

Now, in a revolutionary situation, childhood lies in the past. But in a developing situation, children lie in the future. Lately we have not been paying enough attention to children. The frequency of the "battered child" syndrome and of children suffering from malnutrition and the number of children who burn to death all over this country are symptoms of such strain in a portion of our population that it can no longer think about children in the future, as it was able to do 40 years ago. So Project Headstart certainly marks one move in the right direction.

MRS. PETERSON: I would like you to follow that with any comments you may have relative to the family—and this relates not only to the breakdown of certain minority group families. There is a good deal of discussion about the role of women today, the difference in the family pattern in a woman's life. I think so much relates to this. Would you comment on that area?

DR. MEAD: Of course we have had some statements recently that have read as if the breakdown of family life was specifically a minority group pattern. Actually, the breakdown of family life is one of the concomitants of very low economic status and an inability on the part of the man to earn steadily, which means an unstable family pattern in a society where we either expect the husband to support his wife or favor the support of the wife by all sorts of public institutions when the husband is absent. So today it is possible for a man to say, "You will be better off by yourself. You will be better off than if I married you." We have an incipient institutional structure in which the recognized function is to care for women and children, but the attempt has also been made to punish men who will not take responsibility.

Although a large proportion of our underprivileged population is poor, white, old American, a fairly large share of this group

are Negro Americans who have come from disadvantaged areas in the South. Another section comes from the Caribbean, where different forms of marriage and family life have existed. Within these groups we have a type of life incompatible with our present notion of the responsibility of the head of the household for the wife and children. I think we could equally well say that by our insistence on early marriage we put on the families that are not in this category too much of a burden. It is not only the breakdown of family life at a slum level, or among in-migrants from the country who don't know how to live in the city, that is so serious. There is also the breakdown of family life by forcing young people out into pseudo autonomy too early, before they have had enough education, without any help from any of the institutions in the society. This causes a serious breakdown in family life. It means a high rate of divorce and large number of children who are not living with their parents. This is one of the consequences of the ways in which we are handling young peoples' sense of autonomy—to which my questioner who spoke about Sweden referred. The girls leave home today because it's the only way they can get away from their mothers. Their mothers cannot bear to have them in the same house after they reach puberty. A certain proportion of boys have the alternative of going into the Army. But we are forcing a majority of young people into marriage as the only definition of dignity and autonomy. The minute young people marry and get any kind of a job at all, they are people. But if they are regular students we still treat them as dependents who ought to have handouts. They are treated as non-autonomous and, therefore, we are continually founding families that are nonviable because they are too young.

FROM THE FLOOR: Assuming there has been an overemphasis on employment as a basis for participation in good citizenship, can you comment on the Government programs for the unemployed and give us your suggestions for giving the unemployed some dignity?

DR. MEAD: The question is, assuming too much emphasis has been placed on the importance of employment as giving dignity

and citizenship, would I comment on Government programs for the unemployed? I did not say there is too much emphasis today. This is really the crux of the matter, you see. There could not be too much emphasis right now on the fact that lack of employment means lack of dignity. Yet, we still have to keep in mind that this is not going to be the point 10 years from now. How are we going to make the change?

Every time we speak of young people now, we say the first thing they need is to be trained for a job. So we have the Job Corps program and we train people who haven't had a chance to be trained, and we try to give them training for some job in which they will have some dignity, because they are paid something. These programs are fine as far as they go. But they may also mold our notion that the world consists of employed, unemployed, and unemployables, and these are three categories of human beings. They make our major job seem to be to shift the relationships between these categories. These work categories are seen as the definitions of human beings in our society. They perpetuate the idea that paid employment is the only way to get dignity, not only now, but in the future. With so much emphasis on employment, we are not laying the groundwork for the future.

FROM THE FLOOR: You commented on the stress toward training young people for jobs. In recent years, there has been some push toward training older persons for leisure. I wish you would comment on what I consider a forced choice for old persons between work and leisure.

DR. MEAD: I have talked about the program for training young people for jobs. How about training older people for leisure?

FROM THE FLOOR: I am more interested in the forced choice.

DR. MEAD: The forced choice. Well, of course, to begin with, if you are not going to let old people have anything but leisure and they don't know anything about using it, I don't suppose there is any harm in having a club to teach them. The evil is not in doing something for people who have been forced to retire and with whom you now can think of nothing else to do. The evil is in letting thinking of an economy of scarcity when jobs were lim-

ited and it was economical to keep children in school and retire people as rapidly as possible, influence us now. This shifts our attention from the recognition that in future planning the most valuable thing we are going to have in society is types of experience. In some cases, this will be highly professional, technical experience, and these technical competences may be outmoded. But the other forms of experience are not.

Donald Michael raised in this talk before the seminar group the need for wisdom and how we are going to attain it. Wisdom, as far as we know, is a concomitant of age and experience. That is really what we mean by wisdom. If we can keep older people participating in society and in active relationship to children and people, turn them into teachers instead of putting them on the shelf, and by teachers, I don't mean schoolteachers, but put them in a continuing relation of teaching something, maybe something they have just learned, to young people, we will have a viable society. But if we put more and more older people into golden ghettos, we are creating a form of what people hoped would be a tumor, but which will probably be a cancer.

FROM THE FLOOR: In the recent "Moynihan Report"[1] the point was made that among the people who belong to specific minority groups, family life is not centered or dominated or focused on the male part of parenthood. It seems that Mr. Gorer wrote a book [2] in which he said that this is characteristic of families in the American Nation, because of their immigrant origin. The male is not the head of the family, and the bent of culture direction is his wife. Is this the case, to your knowledge, of our Nation?

DR. MEAD: This question goes back to the "Moynihan Report" and its description of the characteristics of a large number of American Negro families. My questioner said he believes Mr. Gorer wrote and described the American family as not patriarchal, but rather as dominated by women. So I presume the question is: "Are these urban families that have been discussed

---

[1] *The Negro Family* (Washington: U.S. Department of Labor, Office of Policy Planning and Research, March 1965).

[2] Geoffrey Gorer, *The American People* (New York: W. W. Norton Company, Inc., 1948).

as being so unfortunate because the father is not at home any more unfortunate than any other American family?"

You know, we have a prejudice in favor of father being home. He may not have the position that he had in an earlier patriarchal society in Europe or in this country, although these have been somewhat overrated. The division of labor in this country among immigrant groups has always meant that the man had to focus on making a living and the wife had to learn how to live here. This was a tough job for two young adults. So the mother took over the way of life, whereas, in Europe, her husband would have shared the knowledge. In America he may never get it.

It is true that the American family is a more companionate family and that there is a different division of labor from that in Europe. Still, it's completely false, I think, to call this a matriarchal Nation. Women go where their husbands want them to go and they stay where they want them to stay, and they say what they want them to say a good proportion of the time. That's not very matriarchal. The division of labor is different. This does not mean that the dispossessed lowest income groups who are the real poor in the cities are really a matriarchal society because the father plays a lesser role in these families.

It is true that in West Africa the position of women is very high. In a group like the Ashanti in Ghana, one-third of the households were headed by women and they were quite up to the responsibility. Such a group produces the kinds of women that head households.

The dispossession of the father in the United States is the result of his economic position. The extent to which the families of poor American Negroes are less stable is due partly to the earlier condition of slavery and partly to the sheer question of being poor, which they share with all the other people who are poor in our community. It's not an ethnic characteristic. American Negroes don't themselves feel they are sharing in the American pattern. You can see this most sharply the minute Negro Americans get enough education to get a decent job. They form highly conventional, monogamous, stable families with a picture window and a

dog and all the other things that go with it and conform to the American ideal, in which there is the usual division of labor between husband and wife.

FROM THE FLOOR: It seems what you are discussing here may be summed up as a question of choice: what we need to do, and what we do. You said you worked with living models rather than with mathematical, logical models. Yet, in the part of the discussion in which you were talking about advanced societies, you said that in order to point us in the direction we need to go, we have all kinds of statistics that we can amass and analyze or interpret as we see fit. Well, I think I would like to know whether there is an advantage that an advanced society has over a less advanced society?

DR. MEAD: I think there is a tremendous advantage that society has at its disposal, devices for collecting information and using it at once. No society has ever had this before.

FROM THE FLOOR: We can't jump 2,000 years.

DR. MEAD: The jumps we are taking are qualitatively comparable to jumping 2,000 years. When I have been watching my Manus people who were in the Stone Age in 1928 and coming back from them to us, I think that the changes we are facing are comparable in scope and demand on us. This is the first time in history we have known where we are, while we are there. You know, people in the Old Stone Age didn't sit around and say, "It's getting tough in the Old Stone Age. I wish we lived in the New." They didn't know there was going to be a New. The Industrial Revolution was named after the fact. But when the first atom bomb went off, the Atomic Age was named within a week, and within 2 weeks there was a wagon labeled the Atomic Laundry running around.

We are the first period in the whole of history that has ever been able to name itself in terms of technological and economic advances because we realized what was happening. This is primarily due to our capacity to collect information and think about it at the same time. People have been working on the weather ever since man thought about anything. But we could not do any-

thing with weather prediction or weather warnings until we got computers that could work fast enough.

FROM THE FLOOR: We don't know the scale we are measuring something against. A good point is the Russian moonshot, when the British published pictures of it before the Russians did.

DR. MEAD: Mean of them.

FROM THE FLOOR: Consequently, the interpretation was way off.

DR. MEAD: If you don't know the scale, you can't interpret. That's true.

FROM THE FLOOR: I think your remarks started off in the main—

DR. MEAD: No, I wasn't starting with an attack on one method and a defense of another. I was simply saying that one method, and the method I happen to prefer to use, is a living model. This is the one I was trained to use and happen to have the experience to use. This has certain advantages over simulation.

When you are talking about scale, you are talking about a difference between a higher society and a lower society. My village is suffering from urban overcrowding. Another village moved in because my village has a better school. We have our first juvenile delinquency, water pollution, and all of the other problems of the modern world. The village expected 2,000 people for Christmas and wanted to know what resources were available to deal with the 2,000. One resource was pressure lamps. People aren't awfully willing to tell other people when their pressure lamps are working because other people borrow them. So the method of getting a quantitative evaluation of the number of pressure lamps was to say that everyone in the village had to put a mantle on, fill the lamp up with kerosene, light it, and come out and stand behind it. So 40 pressure lamps, all working, were displayed by villagers and we knew how many lights we had for Christmas.

In our present society, we don't have to have everybody get a pressure lamp out to know what our resources are. We have other devices. The scale which my village was working with was small and the method concrete. That is not the scale nor the method

we can work with. I don't think we should underestimate for a minute the fact that we have the information-gathering techniques and the methods for analyzing and interpreting our resources to an extent that no society has ever had before. It is not the difference between a complex and a primitive society. It is not yet the difference between primitive and civilized. The difference between us and people 100 years ago is so striking here. That is the scale difference, the speed of handling large bodies of quantitative material. That is the difference of scale I would emphasize.

FROM THE FLOOR: With the increased pace of automation and education, will a group of educated elite have sufficient to do to maintain its dignity?

DR. MEAD: We have this whole world with an enormously increasing population. Three-quarters of the world is still hungry. The educated elite is going to have enough to do within the next 100 years. After that, I trust it will have experience of activity, working on a planet, and by this time, going into space in decent numbers. I think it will find enough to do. I am not really worrying about work for the educated elite.

MRS. PETERSON: Should I say we need to adjourn so we can get back to leisure? Certainly many thanks to you, Dr. Mead. In parting I would remind you of what Adlai Stevenson said about change. He said that we don't know what is going to be, and anyone who thinks he can stop it had better get out of the way, because he is going to get run over.

Thank you very much.

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1966 O - 238-841

WHERE TO GET MORE INFORMATION

Copies of this publication or additional information on manpower programs and activities may be obtained from the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Administration in Washington, D. C. Publications on manpower are also available from the Department's Regional Information Offices at the addresses listed below.

John F. Kennedy Building, Boston, Massachusetts 02203
341 Ninth Avenue, New York, New York 10001
Wolf Avenue and Commerce Street, Chambersburg, Pennsylvania 17201
Ninth and Chestnut Streets, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107
1371 Peachtree Street, NE., Atlanta, Georgia 30309
51 SW. First Avenue, Miami, Florida 33130
801 Broad Street, Nashville, Tennessee 37203
1365 Ontario Street, Cleveland, Ohio 44114
219 South Dearborn Street, Chicago, Illinois 60604
911 Walnut Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64106
411 North Akard Street, Dallas, Texas 75201
300 North Los Angeles Street, Los Angeles, California 90012
450 Golden Gate Avenue, San Francisco, California 94102
506 Second Avenue, Seattle, Washington 98104

MANPOWER ADMINISTRATION
Office of Manpower Policy, Evaluation, and Research
Curtis C. Aller, Director